

Cyriac of Ancona at Thessaloniki*

MICHAEL VICKERS

At some time in 1431, Cyriac of Ancona visited Thessaloniki, a visit that seems hitherto to have passed unnoticed by scholars who have worked on the history and monuments of that city. A brief account of his stay is to be found in the life compiled by Cyriac's friend Francesco Scalamonti and completed in 1464. A manuscript copy of Scalamonti's work by Felice Feliciano is preserved in the Biblioteca Capitolare in Treviso,¹ but the only published version is of a further copy of the Treviso manuscript printed by G. Colucci in 1792.² Since the account includes a reference to an otherwise unknown monument of Aemilius Paullus in Thessaloniki and also throws light on what seems to have been the earliest recorded inscription there, it has been

* Fr. Edward Bodnar, S.J. and Professor Charles Mitchell were kind enough to read through an earlier draft of this article and to make comments and additions based on the edition of Cyriac's writings on which they are currently engaged. I should also like to thank others who have read it for their valuable observations. Any mistakes remain my own.

1. Treviso, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS. I. 138.

2. G. Colucci, *Antichità picene*, XV (Fermo, 1792), p. lxxxiii. For a useful summary of Cyriac's travels in Greece, see E. W. Bodnar, S.J., *Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens* (Collection Latomus, XLIII [Brussels, 1960]), chap. 1. See too P. W. Lehmann, 'Cyriacus of Ancona's visit to Samothrace', in P. W. and K. Lehmann, *Samothracian Reflections* (Bollingen Series, XCII [Princeton, N.J., 1973]), pp. 3–56. Also useful is R. Weiss, 'Ciriaco d'Ancona in Oriente', in A. Pertusi, ed., *Venezia e l'Oriente fra tardo medioevo e rinascimento* (Civiltà europea e civiltà veneziana, aspetti e problemi, 4 [Venice, 1966]), pp. 323–37, though the date of Cyriac's death should be revised to 1452 in the light of Ch. G. Patrinelis, *Κυριακὸς ὁ Ἀγκωνίτης: Ἡ δὴθεν ὁπηρεσία του εἰς τὴν ἀλλὴν τοῦ σουλτάνου Μωάμεθ τοῦ Πορθητοῦ καὶ ὁ χρόνος τοῦ θανάτου του*, *EEBS*, XXXVI (1968), 152–62.

thought worthwhile to discuss some of the points raised by the passage.³

- f. 52^r Exinde vero per seras se statim ad Thessalonicam contulit, antiquam Macedoniae atque nobilissimam ad mare urbem, in qua primum egregia inter amplissimae civitatis monumenta vidit medio in foro Pauli Aemilii nostri mirificum arcum
 5 et dirruptum Dianae templum, ex quo marmoreae in epistiliis statuae deorum quam plurimae conspiciuntur; vidit et nostrae religionis sacras plerasque ornatissimas aedes, in quibus potissimum inspectare placuerat nobilissimum Demetrii trophaeofori martyris delubrum. Viderat enim insuper
 10 antiqua ex Lysimaco turrita cocto de latere moenia, eiusque et aliorum heroum poetarumque epigrammata; et in tripode Musarum apud Heliconem olim posito de Homeri
 f. 52^v Hesiodique / tempore mentio non vulgaris habetur. Ibi etenim libros plerosque Graecos sacros gentilesque emit,
 15 et per birremem apud Chium ad Andreolum suum transmisit. Exinde per Adrianopolim se iterum ad Calliepolim contulit, ubi acceptis ex Ancone litteris novit, Martino V maximo pontifice defuncto, Eugenium VIII optimum sibi successorem V Non. Martias creatum esse.

1. Thessalonicam *cod.*

5. marmoreae *cod.*

9. trophae fori *cod.*

14. sacris *cod.*

l. 1. *Exinde*: from Philippi.

ll. 4–5. References to an arch of Aemilius Paullus and a temple of Diana, both *medio in foro*. The ‘temple of Diana’, with its marble statues of deities on the epistyle is immediately recognizable as the monument known as ‘Las Incantadas’, which stood in the centre of the city until 1864.⁴ Its original

3. It is through the kindness of Fr. Bodnar and Professor Mitchell that I am able to print a text that is much closer to the Treviso manuscript than Colucci’s transcription.

4. L. Guerrini, ‘“Las Incantadas” di Salonicco’, *Archeologia Classica*, XIII (1961), 40–70, pls. 13–28.

position on the southern edge of the area known to have been the forum has recently been established by Ch. Bakirtzis.⁵ It was not, however, a temple, but part of an elaborate portico. Also *medio in foro*, and presumably near 'Las Incantadas', was the 'arch of Aemilius Paullus'. Other arches are known at Thessaloniki, notably the Arch of Galerius⁶ on the eastern edge of the city, and the Golden Gate⁷ on the west, but neither of them could be described as *medio in foro*. Another arch must be meant—one that disappeared at some time between Cyriac's visit and those of more recent travellers, for none of the latter refer to it. The name, however, presents problems, for it is far from certain that it is authentic, especially as the attribution of the 'temple' to Diana is certainly incorrect. Cyriac did know what to look for on a triumphal arch, having already in 1421 made a close study of the Arch of Trajan at Ancona,⁸ but if this argument is to carry any weight there would have had to be something on the Thessaloniki arch for him to read, and we can be by no means sure that there was. It is probably more realistic to assume that Cyriac was misinformed. Pydna, the scene of Aemilius Paullus' victory in 168 B.C. was but a few miles away from Thessaloniki, and it seems that a likely-looking monument in the middle of the city was pointed out to visitors as commemorating the event. As we shall see below, Cyriac never actively perpetrated falsehoods (which is not the same as saying that he was always right), and we must assume that he was passively recording what he was told about the 'temple' and the arch.

It would in any case be rather difficult to believe in an arch outside Rome at such an early date. Triumphal arches were

5. Ch. Bakirtzis, in a paper delivered at the Second International Symposium 'Ancient Macedonia', Thessaloniki, 1973, and forthcoming in the proceedings.

6. H. P. Laubscher, *Der Reliefschmuck des Galeriusbogens in Thessaloniki* (Berlin, 1975).

7. E. M. Cousinéry, *Voyage dans la Macédoine*, I (Paris, 1831), pp. 25–7, pl. 3; L. Heuzey and H. Daumet, *Mission archéologique de Macédoine* (Paris, 1876), p. 272, pl. 22 bis.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 20. The substantive publication of Cyriac's records and interpretation of Trajan's arch at Ancona is Augusto Campana, 'Giannozzo Manetti, Ciriaco e l'arco di Traiano ad Ancona', *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, II (1959), 483–504.

known there from the beginning of the second century B.C. Livy records the erection of three arches by L. Stertinius in 196 B.C.,⁹ and another by P. Cornelius Scipio in 190 B.C.¹⁰ Arches in the provinces, however, are unknown at such a date, and in fact they only really begin to appear anywhere in any numbers in the Augustan period.¹¹ There was a monument set up by Aemilius Paullus at Delphi, it is true, but it was a pier ornamented with historical reliefs, and not an arch.¹²

ll. 8–9. The *nobilissimum Demetrii trophaeofori martyris delubrum* which stands just to the north of the area of the Forum¹³ was the metropolitan church of Thessaloniki in 1431. Ignatius of Smolensk seems to refer to it as such in 1405,¹⁴ and it was not until much later in the fifteenth century that it became a mosque; an event that has recently been connected with the aftermath of the fall of Granada in 1492.¹⁵

ll. 10–11. References to the walls of the city ‘brickbuilt and turretted’. The attribution to Lysimachus, despite Cyriac’s claim to have seen *eius . . . epigrammata* cannot be correct, for these walls were built in the fifth century A.D.¹⁶ (though they probably

9. Livy, xxxiii, 27.

10. Livy, xxxvii, 3.

11. Cf. M. Pallottino, *EAA*, I (1958), pp. 588–99, s.v. ‘Arco onorario e trionfale’.

12. H. Kähler, *Der Fries vom Reiterdenkmal des Aemilius Paullus in Delphi* (Berlin, 1965).

13. Both the Forum and the church of St. Demetrius appear in the same photograph in R. Schoder, S.J., *Greece from the Air* (London, 1974), p. 216.

14. Mme B. de Khitrovo, *Itinéraires russes en Orient* (Geneva, 1889), p. 147. On the history of the site and the cult, see now M. Vickers, ‘Sirmium or Thessaloniki? A critical examination of the St. Demetrius legend’, *BZ*, LXVII (1974), 337–50.

15. M. Kiel, ‘Notes on the history of some Turkish monuments in Thessaloniki and their founders’, *Balkan Studies*, XI (1970), 142.

16. For the most recent discussions, see M. Vickers, ‘Fifth-century brickstamps at Thessaloniki’, *Annual of British School at Athens*, LXVIII (1973), 285–94; idem, ‘The late Roman walls of Thessalonica’, in E. Birley, B. Dobson and M. Jarrett (eds.), *Roman Frontier Studies 1969, Eighth International Congress of Limesforschung* (Cardiff, 1974), pp. 249–55; and J. M. Spieser, ‘Note sur la chronologie des ramparts de Thessalonique’, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, XCVIII (1974), 507–19.

follow the general lines of the Hellenistic fortifications).¹⁷ There are no inscriptions referring to the king Lysimachus extant in Thessaloniki today, but there are several known which refer to private individuals of that name.¹⁸ Perhaps Cyriac saw one of these, or another that has since disappeared. Not surprisingly he describes the walls of Thessaloniki in similar terms as the roughly contemporary *ex cocto latere moenia* that he saw at Constantinople.¹⁹

ll. 12–13. The ‘unusual reference’ to the chronology of Homer and Hesiod clearly refers to a version of the epigram *Anth. Pal.* vii, 53, which Cyriac elsewhere says he saw at Thessaloniki, and which is preserved in an autograph presentation copy of a collection of inscriptions and drawings excerpted from his diaries made for Pietro Donato and now in Berlin.²⁰ The relevant part of the text reads as follows: ²¹

Scire te non dubito, Petre patrum optume atque celeberrime vir, quom venerandissimae antiquitatis cultorem te semper diligentissimum cognovi, A. Gelium nostrum de Hesiodi et Homeri aetate mentionem habere. Et quod uno denique tempore vixissent, testimonium adducit epigramma quod apud Heliconem in tripode Musis Hesiodus ipse dicarat. Id igitur ut in marmore Atticis consculptum litteris apud Thessalonicam inveni, hoc praedignissimae spectationi tuae loco rescribendum delegi:

17. M. Vickers, ‘Hellenistic Thessaloniki’, *JHS*, XCII (1972), 166–8; cf. Spieser, *op. cit.*, 516.

18. C. Edson (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae*, X, 2, 1 (Berlin, 1972), nos. 27, 97, 113 (excavated in the Serapeum), 243 (excavated in Plateia Vardariou) and 635 (found in the ruins of the Cassandreotic Gate).

19. Colucci, *op. cit.*, p. lxiv. See too, M. Vickers, ‘Mantegna and Constantinople’, *Burlington Magazine*, CXVIII (1976) [forthcoming] for a view of a tower of the Land Walls of Constantinople almost certainly derived from a sketch by Cyriac.

20. Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Ham, MS. 254, fol. 81^v: H. Boese, *Die lateinischen Handschriften der Sammlung Hamilton zu Berlin* (Wiesbaden, 1966) pp. 125ff. See too P. W. Lehmann, ‘The sources and meaning of Mantegna’s *Parnassus*’, *Samothracian Reflections*, p. 106, n. 86.

21. This is a new transcription for which I am grateful to Fr. Bodnar. It differs in several respects from the one that appeared in his *Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens*, pp. 154–5.

ἐπίγραμμα ἐκ τοῦ Ἡσιόδου ποι <η> τοῦ εἰς Θεσσαλόνικα

ΗΣΙΟΔΟΣ· ΜΟΥΣΑΙΣ·
ΕΛΙΚΩΝΕΣΙ· ΤΗΔ' ΑΝΕΘΗΚΑ
ΥΜΝΩ· ΝΙΚΙΣΑΣ.²² ΕΝΧΑΛΚΙΔΙ
ΘΕΙΟΝ· ΟΜΗΡΟΝ

l.7. thelonicam *cod.*

A facsimile was published by Th. Mommsen in 1882,²³ but neither he nor W. Kubitscheck,²⁴ who discussed the epigram in the following year, believed that Cyriac had actually seen it, but rather that he had extracted it from the Anthology and inserted it as a deliberate fraud. But Cyriac's basic honesty in this connection has by now been re-established, thanks to G. B. De Rossi,²⁵ K. Lehmann²⁶ and E. W. Bodnar.²⁷ The consensus is that the words in *marmore Atticis consculptum litteris* imply that Cyriac did see the Hesiod inscription, though it may not have been cut as early as the time that the text was composed.²⁸ It could, however, have been inscribed at any period before late antiquity, and should, therefore, have appeared in *I.G. X*, 2, 1,²⁹ but there is no reference to it either there or in C. Edson's recent

22. It is impossible to say whether ΝΙΚΙΣΑΣ (for ΝΙΚΗΣΑΣ) was a mistake on Cyriac's part or that of the stone cutter.

23. Th. Mommsen, 'Über die berliner Excerptenhandschrift des Petrus Donatus', *Jahrbuch der königlich preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, IV (1883), 77ff., and especially pl. A.

24. W. Kubitscheck, 'Die Glaubwürdigkeit des Cyriacus von Ancona', *Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn*, VIII (1884), 102-3.

25. G. B. De Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, II (1888), pp. 379-81.

26. K. Lehmann, 'Cyriacus of Ancona, Aristotle and Teiresias in Samothrace', *Hesperia* XII (1943), 117, n. 13.

27. Bodnar, *op. cit.*, 159-60. It should perhaps be noted that Cyriac's fidelity in general has been argued by B. Ashmole and C. Mitchell; the former in 'Cyriac of Ancona', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XLV (1959), 25-41 and in 'Cyriac of Ancona and the Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XIX (1956), 179-91, the latter in 'Felice Feliciano Antiquarius', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XLVII (1961), 218.

28. It is also clear that Scalamonti had misunderstood Cyriac's notes in suggesting that the inscription was actually on a tripod.

29. C. Edson, *op. cit.*

account of the history of Thessalonian epigraphical studies.³⁰

ll. 13–14. Reference to purchases of books, mostly Greek, both ‘sacred and profane’ at Thessaloniki. R. Sabbadini knew of these, citing Colucci.³¹ It is interesting to note that while in Adrianople, before going to Philippi and Thessaloniki, Cyriac purchased Greek codices *ex Thessalonicea praeda*.³² The city had fallen to the Turks in the year preceding his visit. Even though the account of the city as retailed by Scalamonti is laconic, there is a slight indication, in the way the Christian churches are still described as ‘very ornate’, that the account of the sack of the city by John Anagnostes may have been a little exaggerated, and that there was perhaps not quite as much material damage as he suggests.³³

l. 15. Andreolus of Chios was Andreolo Giustiniani, one of the leaders of the Genoese commercial company, called the Mahonesi or Maonesi, on the island. Cyriac wrote many letters to him which are to be found in Florence,³⁴ and parts of the correspondence were published in 1773 by G. Targioni-Tozzetti.³⁵

l. 16. Calliepolis = Gallipoli/Gelibolu.

l. 18–19. Eugenius IV succeeded to the pontificate on 3 March 1431.³⁶ The sack of Thessaloniki by the Turks had occurred

30. C. Edson, ‘IG X, 2, 1: Prolegomena’, *Bull. de corr. hellénique*, XCVIII (1974), 521–6.

31. ‘Ciriaco . . . vide e acquistò codici greci sacri e profani a Chio, Leucosia, Salonico e più che tutto nei monasteri dell’isola di Taso’. R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne’ secoli XIV e XV* (Florence, 1905), p. 69.

32. MS. cit. (n. 1), fol. 51^r; Colucci, p. lxxxii (kindly pointed out to me by Fr. Bodnar).

33. Johannes Anagnostes, *De extremo Thessalonicensi excidio narratio*, chap. 21, p. 525 (CSHB).

34. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, cod. Targioni 49.

35. G. Targioni-Tozzetti, *Relazioni di alcuni viaggi etc.*, V (2nd ed., [Florence, 1773]). (Information in this and the preceding note from Professor Mitchell.)

36. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, V (New York, 1967), col. 626.

almost a year earlier, at the end of March 1430.³⁷ Cyriac's visit must have occurred between these dates, but probably later rather than earlier. De Rossi's synopsis of Cyriac's life and travels, which puts his Macedonian visit between 1426 and 1430, needs therefore to be slightly amended.³⁸

*Ashmolean Museum,
Oxford*

37. See, e.g., A. E. Vacalopoulos, *A History of Thessaloniki* (Thessaloniki, 1963), 71–5.

38. De Rossi, *op. cit.*, pp. 358, 385.